

- 9 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS

JAN 10 2007

Claims 17-25 and 58 are objected to because of an informality. Claim 17 has been amended to remedy the situation.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2) for being indefinite. The appropriate correction has been made to provide proper antecedent basis and overcome the rejection.

Claims 17, 18, 24, 25 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Spraggins et al. (US Patent 5,466,484). While the Examiner has identified the cited reference as having US Patent number 5,446,484, the Applicant has assumed that a typographical error occurred and that the reference actually being cited was US Patent 5,466,484. Should this assumption be incorrect, the Examiner is asked to reissue a non-final office action with the appropriate correction.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on the basis that it is defective and requests that it be withdrawn.

The single prior art reference does not disclose every limitation in claim 17. In accordance with MPEP §2131:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the Spraggins reference, "subjecting said thermally-trimmable resistor to a heat source having a power dissipation geometry adapted to obtain a substantially constant temperature distribution across said thermally-trimmable resistor by dissipating more power at the boundaries of a heat-targeted region where there is greater heat loss" is not.

- 10 -

While Spraggins indeed describes pulsing a current through the heating element in order to dissipate power in the form of heat, the layout provided does not allow more power to be dissipated at the boundaries of a heat-targeted region. In fact, the layout taught by Spraggins teaches against this feature, since the heating element and the resistor to be heated are stacked one on top of the other. Therefore, heat can only be applied uniformly across the surface of the resistor, and more power at the boundaries of a heat-targeted region cannot be applied.

Column 1, lines 48 to 53, state the following: "forming a heating element on the major surface, forming an isolation layer over the heating element, forming the resistor on the isolation layer, wherein a portion of the isolation layer is sandwiched between the resistor and the heating element". From this statement, it is clearly understood that the structure proposed by Spraggins is one of overlaying the heating element and the resistor. This configuration does not meet the limitations of claim 17 and therefore, the claim is not anticipated by the reference.

The Applicant believes the present application to be in a condition for allowance and early and favorable notice is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Oleg GRUDIN et al.

By:



Alexandra Daoud, Reg. no. 55,992
CUSTOMER NUMBER 20988

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Alexandra Daoud, Reg. No. 55,992
Name of person signing certification



Signature

January 10, 2007
Date